Registered No. M. 382. September 1912. Vol. XIII. No 3.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR THE

SIDDHĀNTA DĪPIKĀ

AND

ĀGAMIC REVIEW.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to the Study of the ĀGAMĀNTA or the ŚAIVA-SIDDHĀNTA Philosophy and Mysticism, Indo-Dravidian Culture and the Organ of the ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA MAHĀ SAMĀJA.

English Agents: Messrs. Luzac & Co., Opposite British Museum, London.
German Agents: Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig.
American Agents: The Vegetarian Co., Inc., 618, Michigan, Boulevard, Chicago.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION POST PAID.

Rs. 4 (INDIAN), 5s. 6d. or $ 1·25 (FOREIGN).

(FOR BONAFIDE STUDENTS HALF RATES).

Important Notice: All orders for the Journal, payments and remittances of every kind should be sent to the Publisher, "The Light of Truth", and business communications should be addressed to the Manager, "The Light of Truth", Madras, N.C. While exchanges, contributions for insertion, and books for review are to be sent to Mr. J. N. Ramanathan, Choolai, Madras, N.C.

MADRAS:

AT THE MEYKANDAN PRESS, CHOOLAI.

1912.

CONTENTS:

			PAGE.
1.	Panchabrahma Upanishat...	R. A. Sāstry	103
2.	Vaidika Šaiva Siddhānta ...	Śrī Kāsiyāsi Sentinātha Aiyar	105
3.	Cameos	J. M. Nallasvāmi Piḷḷai B.A., B.L.	109
4.	Poetry of St. Appar ...	E. N. Tanikāchala Mudaliyār	112
5.	Is the Soul Immortal? ...	R. R. Guṇaratnam B.A.	118
6.	Pura Nānūru ...	Rev. Dr. G. U. Pope M.A., D.D.	125
7.	Vīrašaiva Religion —Study III.	J. Basavaliṅgappa	129
8.	The Āgamic Bureau Notes.	Editor	141

YATINTRA-MATA-DIPIKA

BY

A. Govindacharya Svamin,
C.E., M.RA.S., M.M.S.

Crown 8vo. 208 pages.
Feather Weight Papaer.
Rs. 2/- Postage Extra.

Apply to—
The Manager, Siddhānta Dipikā,
Madras, N. C.

Wanted Back Volumes of the Siddhanta Dipika.

Vol I to IX for sale.

Vol. XI, XII Calico Bound and gilt Rs. 6/- including postage etc.
Students Half Rates.
Only few copies on hand

Write to the Publisher,
SIDDHANTA DIPIKA,
Madras, N. C

Manimekhalai.

(Translated in English)

BY

The Late Rev. Dr. G. U. POPE,
M.A., D.D.

A Great Epic and one of the Five Great Classics of Tamil.

PRICE ANNAS EIGHT ONLY.
POSTAGE EXTRA.

The Astrological Magazine.

EDITED BY

B. Suryanarain Row,
B.A., M.R.A.S.

A Monthly Journal devoted to Astrology and other scientific subjects

Apply to—The Manager,
Office of the Astrological Magazine,
Suryalaya, MADRAS, N. E.

water, the moon, Gauri, Yajurveda, cloud colour, Sāndrasvara, Dakshināgni, the mantras with fifty syllables, protection and Ichchāšakti.

9. Vāmadeva, which gives the great wisdom, represents Agni, Vidyākalā, Sāmaveda, Svara with eight notes, Dhīrasvara (majestic sound), Āhavanīya fire, knowledge and dissolution energies, and white colour mixed with darkness. He, whose brightness is equal to that of crores of suns, possesses full consciousness and is the leader of the three states (of consciousness). He distributes the fruits of all actions to men, who are in the three states of consciousness, and also bestows on them all the prosperities. He, whose mantra is Eight-syllabled one, resides in the centre of eight-petalled lotus (of the heart).

10. Tatpurusha is he, who possesses the air, the five fires, who is the leader of the mantra energies, and who has the fifty letters and their notes, and Atharvaveda. He is the head of crores of the Ganas (Elements) and whose body is the whole universe. His colour is Red-which gives the desired objects. He is the panacea for all kinds of diseases, the cause of the creation, preservation and destruction &c., and the possesser of all the Šaktis. He is above the three states of consciousness, the fourth (Turīya), and existence, consciousness and bliss himself, He is worshipped by Brahmā, Vishnu and others, and the Supreme Father of all.

11. Īšāna should be known as the Supreme Ruler and the witness of the intelligence. He is the Ether unmanifested, and to be worshipped by the 'Omkāraşvara'. He is all the Devas, calm, and above the calmness, and beyond the 'Svara' (notes). He is the presiding deity of the letters 'A' and other Svaras, and whose body is the Ether itself. He is the cause of the five functions (creation &c.) in the great form of the five Brahmans (Sadyojāta &c). He remains (at the time of dissolution) involving the five Brahmans in himself, and also remains after absorbing all the manifestions of his own māyā in himself. He

shines by his own glory transcending the five Brahmans. He shines in himself in the past, present and future depending on none else.

12. All the Devas, do not realise him, bewildered by the māyā of Śambhu, the Mahadeva, the Guru of the universe and the Cause of all the causes.

13. His form will not stand before any. He is the highest of the highest, the support of the universe, the person, by whom the universe is manifested and in whom it is involved. He is the Supreme Brahman, calm, he is the Supreme abode and I am that Brahman itself.

14. One should understand the five Supreme Brahmans, Sadyojāta and others; whatever we see and hear all are the five Brahmans. These five are, as it were, the divisions of one Brahman. Thus understanding the one as five he reaches Isāna (the fifth). The learned should absorb all, which are in the form of the five Brahmans, in his self and realise that 'I am they', and he reaches Brahman, becoming immortal. He who knows thus, becomes freed from the bondage; there is no doubt in this.

15. Sambhu is in the form of the five-syllabled mantra (Pañchākshara). He is the Supreme Brahman. Knowing the Pañchākshara as consisting from the letter 'Na' to 'Ya', one should repeat the mantra.

16. One should realise the universe as Pañchākshara in the nature of the five Brahmans.

17. He, who studies this vidyā of the five Brahmans with devotion, attaining the state of the five Brahmans, shines himself in five forms.

18. Thus Mahādeva, addressing Gālava, the great Soul, blessing him and disappeared there.

19. By hearing which alone, the unheard things become heard, the unthought, O Sākala, and the unknown is known. Just as by knowing one lump of earth alone, O Gautama, all the Earth is known as the effect (pot &c.) is not separate from the

cause (Mother Earth); just as by knowing one jewel alone, all other metals one known; and just as by knowing one nail parer only, all other iron made things are known, as they are not in nature different from their cause, so is the effect (the universe) not separate from its cause (Isvara). The effect becomes always eternal in the form of its cause. The saying as different is indeed false. The cause is only one, and he is not separate (from the effects) nor with both forms (separateness and non-separateness). The idea of separateness is false, as it is impossible to find out the cause of difference. Therefore the cause is only one, the eternal and secondless. This secondless cause is, surely the Pure Consciousness itself.

20. In this city of Brahman (Body) there is, O Sage, a small lotus like house. In the centre of it, there is a subtle ether. He is Siva, Sat, Chit, and Ananda. He should be sought after by those desirous of Salvation. As He is residing in the heart as the witness of all, without differences, Šiva is called 'Hridaya' (resider in the heart), the liberator from the Samsāra.

Thus ends the upanishat.

R. A. S.

VAIDIKA ŠAIVA SIDDHĀNTA.

It is mentioned in Jābāla Upanishat that

"Brahmachāris said, tell us by repeating what, Amritatva will be for us? Upon which, Yājnāvalkya answered, By repeating *Satarudriya*; these (contained in satarudriya) are the names of *Amrita*, by (repeating) which one will become *Amrita*."

So the names mentioned in Satarudriya are those of Šiva (Amrita) which are the means of producing Amritatva (Šivatva). The word *Amrita* is found in the following Upanishats as the name of eternal *Šiva*:—

Isavasya 11, 14.

Keṇa 2, Khānda 12, 13.

Katha 5, 8; 6. 1, 14, 15, 17.

Prasna 1. 10; 2. 5; 3. 11, 12; 5. 7; 6. 5.

Muṇḍaka 1. 2. 11; 2. 2. 2. 5, 7, 11; 3. 2. 9.

Aitaraya 4. 6; 5. 4.

Taittriya 1. 6, 1, 2; 3. 10. 3.

Chandogya 1. 4. 4, 5; 3. 12. 6; 4. 15. 1; 7. 24. 1; 8. 3. 4; 8. 7. 4; 8. 8. 3; 8. 10. 1; 8. 11. 1; 8. 12. 1; 8. 14. 1.

Brihadāraṇya 4. 4. 2; 4. 5, (1—14); 5. 7. (3—23); 6. 4. 7, 17; 7. 14. 8.

Kaushitaki 3, 2, 8.

Maitri 6. 22, 24, 35.

In Māṇḍūkya the word *Šiva* is found in 7, 12. Although the word *Amrita* means nectar, water, milk &c., in some other places, in the šrutis quoted above it denotes Šiva only. Therefore all the above twelve principal Upanishats belong to Šaivaism only.

Svetāsvatara, Mahānārayaṇa, Kaivalya, Kālāgnirudra, Atharvasiras, Atharvasikha &c., clearly shew that they are Šaiva Upanishats. It is said in 14th Adhyāya of Jñānayoga Khānda of Sūtasamhita,

"Some skilled in Vedasiras call the besmearing the whole body with sacred ashes as Pāsupata; others call it Sirovrata; others, Atyāsrama; others, Vrata and Sambhava."

That is: besmearing the body with the sacred ashes and repeating six mantras is called Pāšupata in Atharvasiras; in Muṇḍaka (3. 2. 10) Sirovrata; in Svetasvatara (6. 2. 1) and Kaivalya, Atyāsrama; in Kālāgnirudra, Vrata and Sambhava.

Sivarahasya says "Those belong to Taittriya think, O Umā, that sacred ashes should not be neglected."

The word Bhuti (sacred ashes) is found in Taittriya 1, 11. 1.

Again the Sūtasamhita says (30th Adhyāya, Yajñavaibhava Khānda) "Besmearing the whole body with sacred ashes and wearing on the forehead and other limbs with three streaks of ashes form appendages to knowledge (Para Vidya).

The 17th mantra of Īsāvāsya and Brihadāraṇya (7. 15. 1) enjoin "Besmear the body with ashes repeating "Agni is the ashes, Vāyu is the ashes, Jalam is the ashes" (i. e. adding the word Bhasma at the end of the words Anilam, Vāyu, Amrita as in the order mentioned in Atharvasiras). As besmearing the body with sacred ashes forms an appendage to the study of Upanishats and Brahma Sūtras, Brahmins should observe the Pāšupata Vrata. This is taught in the Pāšupata-Vrata Adhikarana (Saiva Bhāsya, III. 4. 48, 49), Kailāsa-Samhita, Liṅga-Purāṇa, Vāyu-Samhita, Mahā-Bhārata &c. By the reasons cited above, all the principal Upanishats and the Brahma Sūtras founded upon them are in favour of Šaivism and define the attributes of Śiva-Brahma Parasakti, Jīvātma, &c.

Brihadāraṇya (4. 4. 10; 6. 1. 2; 6. 5. 11) says that Vedas Itihāsas Purāṇas &c. are the breathing of Brahma. Again Vāyusamhita (I Part 1. 24) says that Šiva is the Author of 18 Vidyas. Upon this, if one contends and says that "Nārāyaṇa alone existed not Brahma nor Šiva," and He was the author of all Vedas, Puranas &c. (according to Subala Upaṇishat), we answer as follows. In certain Kalpa, Brahma was the creator of Vishṇu, Rudra &c; in another Kalpa, Rudra created Vishṇu

Rudra &c; in another, Vishnu created Brahma, Rudra, creatures, Vidyas &c. (Vāyu Samhita Part I. 11). Beyond these three, was Šiva Para-Brahma. Therefore what is mentioned in Subala-Upanishat belongs to the intermediate time of creation only.

It is further known from Mahā-Bhārata and Šaiva-Purāṇa that the meanings of Vedas should be expounded by the aid of Itihāsas and Purāṇas; Vāyu-Saṃhita again says that Purāṇas construe the Vedic meanings with great effort, whereas the Saivagamas expound them with great perfectness. Therefore Upanishats, Puranas, and Šivagamas are respectively entitled to be called as šutras, annotations, and vast commentaries. As Vedas and Āgamas stand in relation as Sūtra and Bhāshya, Vedas are called sámānya sruti and Āgamas the special šruti in *Moha-srokta*.

The word *Adhva* (Katha 3. 9) is expounded in Vāyusamhita (Part I. 25, Part II, 15) as six Adhvas i.e. *Mantra, Varna, Pada, Bhuvana; Tatva* and *Kala Adhvas*. In Tatva-Adhva only, there are thirty six principles or Tatvas (which contain twenty four Ātma Tatvas of Prasna (4. 8,) Seven Vidya Tatvas of Svetāsvatara (1. 2,) and five Šiva Tatvas of Brihat-Jābāla (4.19.)

Šiva, Mahešvara, Rudra, Vishṇu, Pitāmaha, Samsāra-Vaidya, Sarvajña, and Paramātma are the eight names of Šiva; as He pervades all from Šiva-Tatva to Earth (numbering thirty six Tatvas), He (Šiva) is called *Vishṇu* (Vāyusamhita Part I. 28. 36). Therefore the name *Vishṇu* found in Rig-Veda (1. 22. 20) and in Katha (3. 9) is only to be appplied to *Šiva*, and not to Nārāyaṇa who pervades only twenty-four Ātma Tatvas. The Dahara Ākāsa Upāsana (திருச்சிற்றம்பல வுபாசனை) taught in the 8th Prapathaka of Chandogya is found in almost all the other Upanishats.

Uma, Haimavati (found in Keṇa) is the name of Parāsakti of Šiva only, who is neither Lakshmi of Nārāyaṇa, nor the Anirvachaniya-māyā-sakti of Ekānmavāda. Kūrma-Purāṇa

says that "Akāsa" and "Vyoma" do mean the Parāsakti of Šiva. Therefore Gargi-Ākāsa of Brihadaraṇya, Ākāša of Chāndogya, and Vyoma of Taittriya &c. denote Parāsakti (Svetāsvatara 6. 18) of Šiva Brahma. By the reasons quoted above, we easily come to understand that all the principal upanishats belong to Šaivaism only, and those who worship the Vedic Šiva according to the prescribed Šaiva rules are called Vaidika-saivas. As Upanishats teach up to Jñānayoga (Vāyusamhita Part I. 28, 6), principal upanishats treat of Path of Light, Brahmaloka (Sivaloka &c.) The Jñāna-Pāda or Siddhānta, the essence of Upanishats is taught in Sarva-Jñānottra, Devikalottara, Šivajñāna-Bodha &c.

The whole Kailāsa-samhita treats of Šivādvaita; this was taught by Subramaṇya to Rishi Vāma-Deva, whose name is found in Aitareya 4. 5, and Brihadaranya 3. 4. 10. The name Šivādvaita is seen in Kailāsa-samhita 10, 96. Šaiva Siddhānta was taught by Šiva first to Vijñānakalas, Praḷayākalas, Sanakas &c. The word Siddhānta is seen in Sivarahasya Khanda, Sambhava Khānda, 3. 51. Siddhānta was also taught by Vāyu to Rishis, and by Upamanyu, the son of Vyagrapāda to Krishṇa, who taught Bhagavad Gita to Arjuna. The name of Siddhānta is found in Vāyusamhita Part I. 28. 72. The word Saiva Siddhānta is found in Vāyusamhita Part II. 24. 177.

Agita-Āgama says,

"Sa eva sarvagas sadbhir Brahma sabdena Sabditah"

that Šiva is called Brahma. Therefore Šrikhanṭha-Achārya is right in interpreting Brahma as Siva according to Srutis, Puranas and Āgamas. Neither Meykandār nor Šivajñāna-Munivar introduced either Šivādvaita or Siddhānta newly.

S. S.

CAMEOS.

SOME RARE SANGAM VERSES.

These verses were supplied to us by Sriman Tirikutarajappan Kavirajar Avargal of the famous Kavirajar family of Melagaram near Tenkasi, from a cadjan manuscript of about 100 verses. The kavirajar explained that many of the verses out of this collection could not deciphered and some were unintelligible to him also. The verses now printed with my translation look like the verses in *Kalitogai* and belong to *Pālai Tinai.* They are very beautiful and the imagery very apt and nice:

I.

நோமே நெஞ்சே நோமே நெஞ்சே !
புன் புலத்த பர்ந்த சீறிலை நெறிஞ்சில்
கட்கினிய மலர் பூத்து முட்பயந்தாங்கு
இனியசெய்த காதலர் இன்னாச் செய்யில் நோமே நெஞ்சே.

It pains me, Oh my heart! It pains!
The small-leaved Nerinji on wayside found
Yields lovely flowers and fruits with spine.
So if my beloved who was once so fond
Is cruel now to me and makes me pine
It pains me Oh my heart! It pains.

II.

(1) உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி ! உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி !
முள்ளுடை அலங்குலை ஈந்தின் சிலம்பிபொதி செங்காய்
துகில்பொதி பவள மேய்க்கும்—அகில்படு
கள்ளியங் காடிறைந் தோர்க்கே.

(1) Will he not think of me, My dear, will he not
My Lord while crossing the Forest of kalli,
which yields the sweet Agil,
When he sees the bunches of the spiny date,
with spider's web covered,
Resemble the coral beads below muslin cloths
Will he not think of me, my dear.

(2) உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி!
இலவமேறிய கலபமஞ்ஞை
எரிபடு மகளிர் எய்க்கும்—அரிபடு
கள்ளியங் காடிறைந் தோர்க்கே.

(2) Will he not think of me, My dear will he not,
My Lord while crossing the forest of kalli,
where lions do roam so free,
When he sees the peacock on the Bombax tree,
with colours rich and gay
Resemble the bereaved women sad,
Entering the flaming pyre.
Will he not think of me, Oh Dear.

(3) உள்ளார் சொல்லோ தோழி!
பருந்து வீழ்ந்தெடுத்த பைந்தலை யரவம்
சாதறுகவண தேய்க்கும்—சீதுறு
கள்ளியங்க காடிறைந் தோர்க்கே.

(3) Will he not think of me, My dear, will he not
My Lord while crossing the forest of Kalli,
full of so much evil
When he sees the Venomous serpent so fine,
on the hawk's talons poised,
Resemble the sling which had become torn.
Will he not think of me, Oh dear.

(4) உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி!
வெள்ளைபு மூக்கநெல்லின் பொரிவீழ்த்தன்ன
நட்கால் புற்றில் மட்சாலியல்
சோல்பிடி குருடரேய்க்கும்—புசல்படு
கள்ளியங் காடிறைந் தோர்க்கே.

(4) Will he not think of me, My dear.
My Lord while crossing the forest of Kalli,
so fearfully dark,
When he sees the ants flying out of the ant-hill
like white fried rice
Resemble the blind with stick being led
Will he not think of me, Oh Dear!

NOTE.

The idea is this. The husband has left his home in search of wealth or education. In the course of his journey he has to

cross the fearful forest where grow the prickly plants and milk hedges and where the lions do roam. While crossing the forest, he sees certain sights, and the Nāyaki who sits at home sad, imagines that her beloved might see the likeness of these sights to certain familiar things nearer at home, and thus think of the fond wife left at home. In the first verse, the date-fruits covered fully with the white web of the spider * is compared to the coral beads worn by herself and covered over by her white muslin dress. †

In the second verse, the peacocks resting on the branches of the wild cotton tree laden with flaming red flowers are aptly compared to women committing Suttee. The lover would naturally be led to fear that his beloved left at home might be led to commit such a deed.

In the third verse, the sling is being used by the bereaved wife while watching her millet field. It had become torn and is hanging from her hands, and she sits on sad in her thoughts without noticing the tornsling; and bag of the sling is compared to the head of the cobra and the strings to its body.

In the fourth verse, the imagery is even much deeper. The boiled rice is fried and jumps out of the fire. The husk is still attached; the fried portion is white and is mottled with red. This is very aptly compared to the breeding ants coming out of the ant-hills, with their head and mottled abdomen. After the wings had been cast off, it will be seen that each female ant is being chased by a male ant and the chase is more like the stutter of the blind than a regular walk and hence the comparison. The further thought is that when a blind husband or wife has his or her partner so faithful though life, the Nayakan had left the side of his beloved wife for the sake of such empty things like gold.

J. M. N.

---

* This can only be realised by people who have visited the forests as to what huge webs the spiders can wave fully covering sometimes whole trees.

† White was the colour of the dress of both men and women of the ancient Tamilians, and we see this custom still persist in malabar yet).

POETRY OF ST. APPAR.

II.

Certain Aspects of St. Appar's Personality as revealed by his poems.

Before entering into this part of the subject, it is very essential to state that an excellent work in English is now available to the public, which treats about the life and personality of St. Appar. It is the work of Śrimān J. M. Nallasvāmi Pillai Avargal, B.A., B.L. President of the Śaiva Siddhānta Mahā Samājam—a reprint from the *Siddhānta Dīpikā* wherein it appeared some time ago as one of its articles. The life, teachings, and the philosophy of St. Appar have been dealt with therein in a masterly way, and it saves one the labour of going through Sekkiḻār's Periyapurāṇam for understanding the same. As he had exhaustively analysed the subject, a treatment of the same in the present essay cannot avoid the repetition of at least some points noted down by the learned author.

The very first thing that startles us in viewing the personality of St. Appar is his extreme modesty and humility of expression. This many sided genius addresses us like our friend or fellow-sufferer. He never wears the garb of a priest or a prophet. To borrow the words of the said learned author, St. Appar's "life of extreme simplicity and purity must have won for him more hearts than all his miracles".* In spite of such a simplicity, his expressions, if thought over, are very deep in meaning and we are constrained to feel that every word in his *Devāram* is the outcome of vast worldly experience. Then the following questions necessarily arise viz.,

(i) Was St. Appar a mere youth or was he tolerably advanced in years at the time of his re-conversion to Śaivaism?

(ii) For how many years was St. Appar a Jain?

(iii) Was St. Appar a celebate throughout his life as is suggested by Sekkiḻār?

If these questions can be answered, the approximate age of St. Appar when he sang "கூற்ருயினவாறு விலக்ககிலீர்" may be easily arrived at.

(a) The Age of St. Appar during the time of the Devāram Composition.

Sekkiḻār, like Shakespeare, consciously or unconsciously depicted certain facts in Periyapurāṇam which give rise to a double set of indications as to the age of St. Appar at the time of his re-conversion to the Śaiva religion. According to one set of indications, his age could not then have been more than nineteen years. According to the other set of indications, he could not have been then less than forty. It is very probable that Sekkiḻār found some conflicts between the then accepted version of St. Appar's biography, and some portions of his *Devāram* wherein St. Appar gives an account of his antecedents. Perhaps this is the reason why Tilagavatiyār's history ends rather abruptly in Periyapurāṇam. And in examining the age, extracts have been taken from "St. Appar, His life and teachings" above referred to.

The first set of age indications may be summarised thus:—Tilagavathiyār, the elder sister of St. Appar was betrothed to Kalippagaiyār (king Pallava's general) at about twelve years of age......Before the marriage a war broke out and he died in the battlefield. Though she resolved to follow her love, she consented to live, but to a life consecrated to the service of God and to the loving care of her brother. The boy grew......with the advancement of his knowledge his adhesion to Jains grew apace and he finally......joined their Saṅgam......This secession ......troubled......Tilagavatiyār......She sent up earnest prayers for the conversion of her beloved brother and this was soon answered.

These facts would make one believe that *Vāgiśar* hardly passed the age of majority when he was converted to Samaṇam,

and that within a few months he was reconverted. These combined with the episode of the heavenly damsels appearing before him shortly before the termination of his (worldly) life suggest that St. Appar was a young Śaiva Sanyāsi when he was relieved from the painful colic. This suggestion is to some extent proved by the allusion on the surface of his fifth stanza "காத்தாள்பவர் காவலிழந்தமையாற் கரைநின்றவர் கண்டுகொளென்று சொலி, நீத்தாய் etc."

Let us now examine the second set of age-indications:—St. Appar "soon became a great figure among them (Samaṇas) and they named him *Dharmasena.* His reversion to his ancestral faith could not remain long a secret, and the news spread to the Jain monastery, and it galled them to the quick; and they apprehended that *the cure and reversion of our saint would strike a death-blow to their own power and influence.* Filled with hate and such misgivings, they fled to their Pallava king and prayed him to bring Tirunāvukkarasu to justice. *He became greatly incensed* at this act of treachery on Dharmasena's part as it was represented to him....."

To become a Samaṇa priest should have been a matter of at least some years. Samaṇas who were intellectual giants would not have chosen St. Appar as one of their leaders but for their long standing confidence in his Samaṇa orthodoxy, and their appreciation of his knowledge and vast experience in life. If St. Appar were a mere youth converted to Samaṇam in a fit of religious frenzy and re-converted within a short period by an apparently superstitious cause, Samaṇas would have taken no notice of it, and the matter would have been so important as to make them apprehend that it would strike a death blow to their unlimited power and influence. Besides would it be reasonable to suppose that the Pallava king who was no tyrant would have ordered extreme torture against St. Appar unless specific acts of treachery other than his mere reconversion were alleged at least, against him.

These difficulties throw doubt upon the suggestion that St. Appar was a youth at the time of his re-conversion, and

DR. U.V. SWAMINATHA IYER LIBRARY
TIRUVANMIYUR . MADRAS-4

make us suspect that he ought to have then been a person somewhat advanced in age. In vain do we look into Periyapurāṇam for a solution. But we find one fact therein which strengthens our doubt, the name 'Appar itself was given by Jñānasambandar. The word is equivalent to the modern colloquial "அண்ணா" (which is not exactly equivalent to 'Papa') in addressing any of our respectable elderly friends. If St. Appar was a young man, certainly Jñānasambandar would not used that appellation, but something else. So we have as the last resource the internal evidence furnished by St. Appar's Devaram itself. St. Appar makes many statements which are clearly autobiographical which throw light on this question as well as those regarding his celebacy, and the approximate period of his career as a Samaṇa.

The life of St. Appar subsequent to his reconversion was undoubtedly one of strict ascetic celibacy. The version of Sekkiḻār is supported in this respect by the following stanzas of *Devāram* :—

"விளைவறிவிலாமையாலே வேதனைக்குழியிலாழ்ந்து
களைகணுமில்லே னெந்தாய் காமரங்கற்றுமில்லேன்
றளையவிழ் கோதை நல்லார் தங்களோடின்பமெய்த
இளையனுமல்லே னெந்தா யென்செய்வான் றோன்றினேனே."

—குறைந்த திருநேரிசை Stanza 9.

"விளக்கின்ற வினையைநோக்கி வெண்மயிர் விரவி மேலு
முளைக்கின்ற வினையைப் போகமுயல்கிலேனியல வெள்ளந்
திளைக்கின்ற முடியினான்றன் திருவடி பரவமாட்டா
திளைக்கின்றே னிருமியூன்றி யென்செய்வான் றோன்றினேனே."

—Ibid. Stanza 8.

From these we see only a figure in grey hairs. What was his previous life? Though St. Appar is apt to exaggerate his own supposed faults, can we say that the following is the utterance of one who was a bachelor throughout his life? We cannot deny the sincerity of the following statements:—

"இல்வினார் மாதர்பாலே யிசைந்து நானிருந்து பின்னு
நிலவுநாள் பலவென்றெண்ணி நீதனேயாதியுன்னை

யுலவி நாணுள்கமாட்டே னுன்னடி பரவுஞானஞ்
செலவிலேன் செய்வதென்னை திருப்புகலூரனீரே."

—திருப்புகலூர் திருநேரிசை Stanza 6.

"பாலனாய்க்கழிந்தநாளும் பனிமலர்கோதை மார்தம்
மேலனாய்க்கழிந்த நாளு மெலிவொடு மூப்புவந்து
கோலனாய்க் கழிந்தநாளுங் குறிகொளிலாதுகெட்டேன்
சேலுலாம் பழனவேலித் திருக்கொண்டீச்சரத்துளானே."

—திருக்கொண்டீச்சரம் திருநேரிசை Stanza 9.

Again the following short stanza he puts forth in a climax of the various grades of pleasures:—

"கனியிலுங் கட்டிப்பட்ட கரும்பிலும்
பனிமலர் குழற் பாவை நல்லாரினும்
தனிமுடிக்கருத்தாளு மரசிலு
மினியன் றன்னடைந்தார்க்கிடை மருதனே."

—திருவிடைமருது திருக்குறுந்தொகை Stanza 10.

These can never be the stanzas of one who was unknown to woman. Then was he a *Grahastha* before he became a *Sanyasi*? If we do not twist any esoteric meaning or construction to the following stanzas, the fact seems patent though it is difficult to guarantee that these stanzas can have only one meaning:—

"சுற்றமுந் துணை நன்மடவாளொடு
பெற்றமக்களும் பேண லொழிந்தனர்
குற்ற மில்புகழ் கொண்டீச் சுரவனார்
பற்ற லாலொரு பற்றுமற் றில்லையே."

—திருக்கொண்டீச்சரம் திருக்குறுந்தொகை Stanza

"மக்களே மணந்த தார மவ்வயிற்றவரை யோம்பும்
சிக்குளே யழுந்தி யீசன் றிறம்படேன் றவமதோரேன்
கொப்புளே போலத் தோன்றி யதனுளே மறையக்கண்டு
மிக்களே பரத்தை யோம்ப வென்செய்வான் றோன்றினேனே."

—குறைந்த திருநேரிசை Stanza 2.

The theory that St. Appar once lead a married life and had children and grandchildren thereby is consonant with the incident in Periapuranam about St. Appar's demanding the presence of Appudi's children at the time of his dinner, and consequently detecting the death of Appudi's son by a serpent's poison. The autobiographical hints in his Devaram taken with

நூல் நிலையம்,
சென்னை-600090.

the peculiar conduct of king Pallava aud Samaṇas, lead su to conjecture that he was probably married to a good lady in the Samaṇa royal family having some close relationship with king Pallava, and during the married life which appears to be somewhat a long period he was a Samaṇa bigot, and was hating Šaivaism.* Perhaps after some domestic calamities ¶ and finally with the colic disease, he came out ‡ as a Šaiva Sanyāsi and was then imprisoned § by Samaṇas under various unknown charges and was made subject to inhuman tortures. The chapter திருநிலைக்குடி—திருக்குறுந்தொகை in the second Tirumurai seems to be one continuous address to his family circle. In it the stanzas 1, 6 and 7 (put together) are the *summa* of his arguments :—

---

* Vide the third Tirumurai திருவீரட்டானம்—ஏழைத்திருத்தாண்டகம்.

¶ The following stanza is not devoid of reference to himself :—

"யாத ராரொடு மக்களுஞ் சுற்றமும்
பேதமாகிப் பிரிவதன் முன்னமே
நாதன் மேவிய நல்லந கர்தொழ
போது மின்னெழு மின்புக லாகுமே."

—திருநல்லம், திருக்குறுந்தொகை Stanza 7.

‡ "கேட்டிலேன் கிளைபிரியேன் கேட்குமா கேட்டியாகில்
நாட்டினே னின்றன்பாத நடுப்பட நெஞ்சினுள்ளே
யாட்டினீர் வாளைபாயு மல்கு சிற்றம்பலத்தே
கூட்டமாங்குவி முலையாள் கூடநீ யாடுமாறே."

—கோயிற்றிருநேரிசை Stanza 3.

§ "அஞ்சைக்களத்துள்ளா ரையாற்றுள்ளா
ராரூரார் பேரூரழுந் தூருள்ளார்
தஞ்சத்தனிக்குளத்தார் தக்களூரார்
சாந்தைய யவந்தித் தங்கினார்தா
நஞ்சைத் தமக்கமுதாவுண்ட நம்பர்
நாகேச்சரத்துள்ளார் நாரையூரார்
வெஞ்சொற் சமண் சிறையிலென்னை மீட்டார்
வீழிமிழலையே மேவினாரே."

—திருவீழிமிழலை, திருத்தாண்டகம் Stanza 8.

"வைத்த மாடு மனைவியு மக்கணீர்
செத்த போது செறியார் பிறிவதே
நித்த நீலக் குடியர னைநினை
சித்த மாகிற் சிவகதி சேர்திரே."

*　　*　　*　　*

"கொன்றை சூடியைக் குன்றமகளொடு
நின்ற நீலக்குடியானே யெனீர்
என்றும் வாழ்வுகந் தேயிறு மாக்குநீர்
பொன்றும்போது நமக்களிவொண்ணுமோ."

"கல்லினோடெனைப் பூட்டிய மண்கையர்
ஒல்லைநீர்புக நூக்க வென்வாக்கினால்
நெல்லுநீள்வயல் நீலக்குடியான்
நல்லநாம நவிற்றியுந் தேனன்றே."

Anyhow it is not an easy affair to assign any definite interpretation as the correct one to any required text of St. Appar's Devāram. So his antecedents prior to his reconversion to Śaivam is a matter which demands considerable research, and I leave this task to the Tamil scholars interested in the same. But there is one thing which can be stated with a great degree of probability, namely, that St. Appar sang his "கூற்றாயினவாறு etc" when he was in his grey hairs, not before his fortieth year, and he seems to have continued to sing his beautiful hymns for nearly four decades* till he became very ripe in years.

(To be continued.)

E. N. T.

IS THE SOUL IMMORTAL.

(Continued from page 200 of No. 5 Vol. XI.)

To the argument which Psychology affords in favour of immortality can be added another equally strong one from Evolution. Evolution regards man as the final product of long and mighty cosmic changes, and finds in him, in addition to the

* cf. "பத்திமையாற் பணிந்தடியேன் றன்னைப் பன்னாட்
பாமாலை பாடப் பயில்வித்தானை etc."
—Stanza 3. திருப்புள்ளிருக்கும் வேளூர் திருத்தாண்டகம்.

action of *Natural Selection* whereby the physical frame of man has come to be what it is, the beginning of what may be termed *Ethical Selection* or selection by man of the true, the good, and the beautiful. According to this theory, man is not miraculously flung into the world as a finished product with such features of the body and mind, as we find described in the third chapter of Genesis, but is the slow outcome of innumerable births or stages of existence. He began the long and tedious journey of life as a 'protoplasm', and has, by his own exertions, his hard struggle for æons, made himself "the roof and crown of things." To trace this slow and subtle process would take me outside the subject and demand volumes. But suffice it to say here that man is the rarest and highest product of Evolution, that his body presents the most beautiful form possible in the nature of things, and that his mind contains the rudiments of becoming as perfect as even God himself. Avvai recognises this importance when she says:—

"அரிதரிது மானிடராவ தரிது
மானிடராயினுங் கூன் குருடு செவிடு
பேடுநீங்கிப் பிறத்த லரிது ;
பேடுநீங்கிப் பிறந்தகாலையும்
ஞானமுங் கல்வியுந் நயத்தலரிது ;
ஞானமுங் கல்வியுந் நயந்தகாலையுந்
தானமுந் தவமுந் தாஞ்செயலரிது ;
தானமுந் தவமுந் தாஞ்செய்வராயின்
வானவர்நாடு வழிதிறந்திடுமே."

And Svāmi Tāyumānavar echoes the same sentiments in the following lines:—

"எண்ணரிய பிறவிதனின் மானுடப் பிறவிதா
னியாதினும் மரிதரிதுகா
ணிப்பிறவி தப்பினாலெப் பிறவிவாய்க்குமோ
வேதுவருமோ வறிகிலேன்

* * * * * * *

These sages understood the term "man' to mean not the body which turns to a handful of ash (பிடிசாம்பல்), but the 'inner man' the soul which is incorruptible and everlasting; and when they

speak of the birth of man as a rare phenomenon, they mean that only by being born a man with the power of deciding the right from wrong, it is possible for one to attain *Mukti*. That their opinions are well-founded is evident from the following words of John Fiske. Arguing that on the earth there will never be a higher creature than man, he says:—

"No fact in nature is fraught with deeper meaning than this two sided fact of the extreme physical similarity and enormous physical divergence between man and the group of ainmals to which he traces his pedigree. It shows that when humanity began to be evolved an entirely new chapter in the history of the universe was opened. Henceforth, the life of the nascent soul came to be first in importance, and the bodily life became subordinated to it." In the subsequent paragraph, he adds "According to Darwinism the creation of man is still the goal toward which nature tended from the beginning. Not the production of any higher creature, but the perfecting of humanity, is to be the glorious consummation of Nature's long and tedious work. Thus we suddenly arrive at the conclusion that man seems now, much more clearly than ever, the chief among God's creatures.

In his book on "The Destiny of Man", from which the above words are quoted, the author proves to the hilt that a higher creature than man will never appear on earth, and shows that the evolution of man lies not in the physical, but in the psychological and ethical plane. This is no doubt true. For Natural Selection, after it has produced in man a symmetrical shape and form, and endowed him with the potentialities of becoming humane, wise, and philosophic, has resigned its post in honour of Ethical Selection or selection by man. Hence we no longer see the action of Natural Selection in the highest product of Evolution, but only in the lower regions of organic life. But the process by which this elimination was effected was very slow and gradual. It has taken ages for man to throw off his brute-inheritance. In spite of all that the Church and the State have done towards his moral and spiritual

advancement, there still lurks in him "the ape and the tiger," and it is difficult to say whether in this world or the world to come he will throw off the last vestige of his ancestry, and become "the lamb" of God to live with Him for ever and ever. That man must at one time or other throw off his brute-inheritance is a strong inferrence that follows from the theory of Evolution. He has in himself, as we have said before, the potentialities of making himself perfect in every way. And this is the meaning of that authoritative and inspiring command of Christ: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." The progress man has made during the last thirty centuries has been immense indeed. From that naked state of ignorance and barbarism, when he behaved like the beasts of the field, and had no higher standard of morality than that of the kennel or poultry yard, he has gradually developed himself in intelligence and morality, so as to learn the secrets of nature, to master its various and discordant elements, and to build such institutions as a family, state or church. This progress is destined to go on in the future as it has done in the past till man completely realises in himself his oneness with God. The creative energy that has been at work during the past will not fall asleep tomorrow, but will continue till it accomplishes its purpose. And it is in the way, this energy works, that we find a strong argument in favour of immortality.

This energy works principally in two ways—Natural Selection and Ethical Selection or Selection by man. Of these, the first is blind, is confined to the lower regions of life and works through death; the second is intelligent, is found in the highest forms of life, and works through life. The former regards might as right and is the governing principle in the animal world, while the latter recognises temperance, justice, righteousness, sympathy, love, and such qualities as the cardinal virtues of life, and builds on them the foundation of a complete and perfect life. Though these two *Selections* are diametrically opposed to each other, yet they are indispensable to the formation of the highest types of Evolution. The one

lays the foundation and ends where the other begins. We shall briefly show here how they work.

In the course of Organic Evolution it has been observed that certain functions are indispensable to the birth of higher functions, though in themselves they are not so, and become extinct after they have served the purpose required, and that there are certain functions, which remain ever useful, and are worthy of being fostered and cultivated. The first man, who in the formation of his body and the development of his mind resembled the orang outang of the Malay Peninsula, had in him more of animal nature than human or divine. And it was but necessary that it should have been so. Else it would have been difficult for him to get on in the world—nay even to live in it. For, if his animal nature had not been equal to that of his fellows, if he had been slow, soft or mild, he would have been kicked out of his place by the stout and the strong, and left in the lurch to die of starvation and want. On the other hand, if he had been as shrewd and strong as his fellows, he would have held his ground, and demanded "an eye for an eye, or a tooth for a tooth". Hence, for the mere sustenance of life, it was necessary that the first man should have had a good deal of animal nature in him. But with the gradual formation of the family, the tribe, the state, and the church, the animal nature in man became transformed into human or divine, and such qualities as courage, tenacity of purpose and love evolved out of selfishness, Jealousy and self-love. Our purpose here is not to trace the origin and development of morality and religion, but only to show the line in which Evolution works, and point out whither it tends and what message it gives us as to a future life.

The conditions that prevailed during the primitive periods, when man wandered from place to place in search of food and shelter were such that he had to keep up a continual struggle for his existence. And his animal nature, as we have said before, was then indispensablb to him. But as the conditions of living changed with the progress of society, peace and order

became more useful than strife and confusion. Accordingly that man became healthy, active and prosperous, who settled down, cultivated his grounds and established a home, while his brother, who boasted of his physical strength, craftiness and pugnacity went to the wall. Natural Selection thus parts company with man, when he has risen above his animal nature, and Ethical selection takes its place. It is at this parting of ways' that we rightly understand the words of Christ, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." At the primitive state of mankind, this beautiful and meaningful statement would have been regarded as nothing but stuff and nonsense, even as it is regarded to-day by him whose spirit is overcloyed with materialism and worldliness. But he, who understands it rightly finds in it the goal towards which Evolution has been tending from the very first. The aim of Evolution has been not to produce Herculean stature and strength, selfishness, jealousy and hatred, though these were indispensable at its early stages, but to bring forth a sweetness of disposition, mildness, meekness, and love and make man enjoy perpetual joy and peace with his Maker. Prof. Henry Drummond puts it clearly in the following words:—"What is evolution? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect living beings. What is Christianity? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect living beings. Through what does Evolution work? Through love.* Through what does Christianity work? Through love. Evolution and Christianity have the same author." The same might be said of the other religions also. This, then, is the message of Evolution—"*To make more perfect living beings.*"

* It might not appear on the surface that Evolution works "through love." At early stages, one cannot fail to observe destruction, slaughter and death on all sides. But though apparently it destroys, its purpose is to build. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." That Evolution works "through love" becomes evident when we look to its goal, which is the perfecting of humanity.

But in this planet of ours, we find no man who has reached the final goal of Evolution. Though here and there we see glimpses of partial perfection, yet such ideal perfection as is expected from Evolution no where do we find. Even the greatest Jñānis and sages to testify to their weakness and imperfection. Are we, then, to regard Evolution as having failed in its purpose? Has all the work it has done for *yugas* been done for nothing? Is the man, whom it has developed through innumerable stages of growth, to disappear like a bubble that bursts? To these questions the answer comes from John Fisk. He says that "he who regards man as the consummate fruition of creative energy, and the chief object of divine care, is almost irresistibility driven to the belief that the soul's career is not completed with the present life upon the earth". This is a logical inference from Evolution which no one can gainsay. True it is that man cannot realise a complete perfection of his spiritual nature in this life as long as his soul is enshrouded by the perishable body, which Svāmi Tāyumānavar calls மலப் பாண்டம், the pot of filth. But, if it leaves the world after it has attained, the required spiritual development, it is bound to live with its father in heaven, and enjoy "that peace which passeth understanding."

"Life is real, life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal.
'Dust thou art, to dust returnest'
Was not spoken of the soul".

The argument I have given in this essay from the theory of "the Subliminal consciousness" and Evolution are the two strongest arguments in support of Immortality. To these might be added the forcible, but oft repeated, arguments from theology. And I leave them to the priests and the clergy.

In my next essay I shall endeavour to prove that the animals also have souls.

R. R. G.

PURA-NANURU.

XIX.

இமிழ்கடல் வளைஇய வீண்டகன் கிடக்கைத்
தமிழ்தலை மயங்கிய தலையாலங் கானத்து
மன்னுயிர்ப் பன்மையுங் கூற்றத் தொருமையு
நின்னொடு தூக்கிய வென்வேற் செழிய
விரும்புலி வேட்டுவன் பொறியறிந்து மாட்டிய
பெருங்கல் லடாரும் போன்மென விரும்பி
முயங்கினே னல்லனோ யானே மயங்கிக்
குன்றத் திறுத்த குரீஇயினம் போல
வம்புசென் றிறுத்த வரும்புண், யானைத்
தூம்புடைத் தடக்கை வாயொடு துமிந்து
நாஞ்சி லொப்ப நிலமிசைப்புரள
வெறிந்துகளம் படுத்த வேந்துவாள் வலத்த
ரெந்தையொடு கிடந்தோரெம் புன்றலைப் புதல்வ
ரின்ன விறலு முளகொ னமக்கென
மூதிற் பெண்டிர் கசிந்தழ நாணிக்
கூற்றுக் கண்ணோடிய வெருவரு பறந்தலை
யெழுவர் நல்வலங் கடந்தோய்நின்
கழூஉவிளங்காரங் கவைஇய மார்பே.

On the broad land composed of gathered atoms surrounded by the sounding sea, at Talai-Alangānam, where Tamil armies were co-mingled,—thou didst ponder with thyself the multiplicity of human existences and the oneness of Death,—Victorious spear-hurling *Chēḻiyan*! I have embraced thy breast adorned by circling garlands of chaste pearls, have I not? It is like the strong stone-projecting engine, with which the hunter skilfully traps the great tiger; while bewildered like the race of birds that abide in the hills, the elephant wounded sorely by the arrow, lacerated in mouth and hollow trunk, rolls like a ploughshare its trunk along the ground! Together with my sire the

youthful heads of my children have been laid low! Is such the victory we share? While thus the matrons of the old warlike homes mingle tears with joyous exultation, and death ashamed feels pity at the sights of the dreadful battlefields, where the valiant seven fell vanquished.

NOTE.

[The *Tinai* of this ode is Vāgai, which consists in the Victor crowning himself with the flower of the Vāgai tree. The *Turai* is Arasa Vāgai in which the glory of the Victorious King is praised. The poet who sang this Ode is the same as the author of No. 18, named *Kuda Pulaviyarar* and nothing more is known about him. Not so however is the subject of the ode itself. He is called Pandiyan *Talaiyalankānattu Cheru Venra* Neduncheḻiyan, i.e. Pāndiyan Neduncheḻiyan who won the battle of Talaialaṅkānam. He seems to have ascended the throne at an young age, and there was a combination of the Tamil Kings Cheran and Choḻan and their feudatories Títhian, Eḻini, Erumaiyūran, Irumbo Veṇman, and Porunan. He conquered Miḻalaikûṟṟam of Veḷ Evvi, and Muttûṟṟu Kûṟṟam of old Velir. There are no historical or epigraphical records of the battle of Talaialankānam but that it was a decisive one and which marked a new era there can be no doubt. Says Professor Sundaram Pillai, (pp. 70, 71 No. 5. The Tamilian Antiquary.) "It is impossible to doubt, with these facts before us that Talaialankānam was the scene of a decisive victory, which at once raised the prestige of the Madura Country and stirred up the literary activity of its people. In all probability, Alankāram bore the same relation to the age of Narkirar and his College, that the defeat of the Armada bore to the Elizabethan era of English letters. When more of the real history of these ancient times comes to be known, Alankānam and the Madura College will be found to afford but another illustration of the well-established induction that links the literary progress of a nation with its political pre eminence. But whether more of the history of the age is likely to be known or not, this much is beyond question, that the hero of Ālankānam was a restless warrior of the times, and that he had certainly more stern duties to perform than offering prizes for poems on the tresses of his lady-love, as the *Stala Purana* would have it." Mr. S. Krishnasvāmi Iyengar observes that with this battle, the Chera ascendency passed away. As regards his identity there is some doubt. Professor Sundaram Pillai would identify him with Ugra Peru Vaḻuthi of Tiruvilayādal Purāṇam and who was

con nected with the third Saṅgam. The learned Editor says that Mr. Krishnasvāmi Iyengar also makes out the same. But his '*Ancient India*', (pp. 350 to 35), he makes this Nedum Cheḻiyan of Talaialaṅkānam fame grandson of Ugra Peru Vaḻuthi called also Nedumcheḻiyan. We also think there were two such, and Ugra Pāṅdiyan Nedumcheḻiyan is the subject of Narkîrar's Nedunal Vādai, though Nachchinārkiniyar would have it that it referred to our Hero.

To the laurels he won in the battle field, he added the laurels of Peace and performed several sacrifices and was a great patron of the fine arts. He himself was a poet of no mean order (No. 72 of this collection is ascribed to him.) *Mathurai Kanji*, one of the Pattu Pāttu (Ten Idylls) contains the best eulogium of the King and was composed by Mangudi Maruthanār (referred to in No. 72), *Nedunal Vādai*, also of the Ten Idylls which Professor thinks was the best of the collection was also composed in his honour by Narkirar according to Nachinārkiniar in his praise. As many as 12 of the odes in this collection were composed by a number of poets in his praise. ED.]

XX.

இருமுந்நீர்க் குட்டமும்
வியன்ஞாலத் தகலமும்
வளிவழங்கு திசையும்
வறிது நிலைஇய காயமும், என்றாங்
கவையளந் தறியினு மளத்தற்கரியை
யறிவு மீரமும் பெருங்க ணோட்டமுஞ்
சோ றுபடுக்குந் தீயோடு
செஞ்ஞாயிற்றுத் தெறலல்லது
பிறிதுதெற லறியார் நின்னிழல்வாழ் வோரே
திருவில் வல்லது கொலைவில் லறியார்
நாஞ்சி லல்லது படையு மறியார்
திறனறி வயவரொடு தெவ்வர் தேயவப்
பிறர்மண் ணுண்ணுஞ் செம்மனின் னாட்டு
வயவுறு மகளிர் வேட்டுணி னல்லது
பகைவருண்ணா வருமண் ணினையே
யம்புதுஞ்சுங் கடியரணா
லறந்துஞ்சுஞ் செங்கோலையே

புதுப்புள் வரினும் பழம்புட் போகினும்
விதுப்புற வறியா வேமக் காப்பினை
யனையை யாகன் மாறே
மன்னுயி ரெல்லா நின்னஞ் சும்மே.

Peace After War.

The depths of the mighty sea with its triple waters;—the extent of the wide earth;—the amplitude of the sky where the winds career;—the etherial regions of the formless space:—though we may measure these, thou art not to be measured; and as to wisdom, beneficence and benevolence, no heat, but that of the fire which cooks the rice, and that of the crimson sun do those who dwell beneath thy shadow know! The Bow of Heaven these know, but not the bow whose arrow slays! Thy ploughshare they know, but other weapon none! Mighty warriors and foes against whom they fight are gone and thou, O prince, dost enjoy the fruit of those alien lands! Thou dost enjoy with those thou lovest this happy land! And thy foes know not its enjoyment. Thou wieldest a sceptre guarded by well defended fort, which arrows protect, and virtues make secure. Though new fates await us and the old fates fail, thou guardest thy realm with strength that wavers not. Such art thou, and for reasons such as these, all living creatures venerate thy name.

G. U. P.

Note.

[The *Tinai* and *Turai* are the same as in the preceeding ode; though Nachchinārkiniar takes it as an instance of *Ombadai* of *Pādāṇtiṇai* in which the might, and glory, liberality and benevolence of one has to be set forth.

The Singer was Kurumkoḻiyurkiḻar and the patron addressed was Cheraman Yānaikkat Chei Māntharan Cheral Irumporai. He was the grandson of the Cheraman Senguttuvan the great, and was unfortunate enough to be defeated and imprisoned by Neduncheḻiyan of Talaialankā-nam fame. Ed.]

VĪRAŠAIVA RELIGION—STUDY III.

Antiquity :—Some people think that the Vīrašaiva Religion was newly founded by Basavešvara of Kalyan. It must be understood that Basavešvara is only a reformer of the Vīrašaiva Religion and not the founder. It is nowhere said either in Basavapurāṇa or in any of the Vīrašaiva works that Basavešvara founded the Vīrašaiva Religion. On the other hand, according to Āgamas, the origin of the Vīrasaiva Religion is thus given. It is said that Brahma wanted to create the world. He could not do it as he did not know how to do it. He asked Šiva to show him the way of creating the world. Then Šiva created out of his *chit* the five Acharyas viz: Renuka, Dāruka, Gantakarna, Gajakarṇa and Visvakarna. The descendants of these Acharyas and all those that have been converted by them and their descendants are called the Vīrašaivas or the Aprākritas. After this, Brahma created, out of Prakriti i. e. matter, the four castes and other living things. They are called Prākritas. This is, of course, a story. But this serves to show that the belief among the Vīrašaivas is not that Basavešvara founded their religion, but that their religion is existing from the beginning. There is also the evidence of the Vedas, Upanishads, Smritis, Puraṇas, Ithihasas and Āgamas to show that the Vīrašaiva Religion existed at the time of their compilation, because they suggest and treat of Liṅgadhārana which is the distinctive charactestic of the Vīrašaiva Religion. Besides these, there is some extraneous evidence to show unequivocally that the Vīrašaiva Religion is a very ancient religion, that it was reformed by Basavešvara of Kalyan, but not founded by him and that it existed at the time Šrī Šaṅkarâchârya and prior to him. Professor H. H. Wilson, in his Religions of of India, says that Šaṅkara Digvijaya was written by one Ānandagiri, an immediate discriple of Šrī Saṅkarâchârya, and

this was a work of the time of Šaṅkarâchârya. In this work, he says, that five divisions of Šaivas are mentioned with whom Šaṅkara disputed. They are Šaivas, Raudras, Ugras, Bhaktas and Jaṅgamas. Their respective characteristics are also given. The characteristic of Jaṅgamas according to the work, was the carrying of the figure of Liṅga on the head. Professor. H. H. Wilson says that while all the other divisions have now disappeared, the Jaṅgamas only continue, showing that the present day Jaṅgamas are the same as the Jangamas of the time of Šri Šaṅkarâchârya. This shows that the Vîrašaiva Religion existed at the time of Śri Šaṅkarâchârya. In this connection there is another important thing to be noted. Professor H. H. Wilson says that the works that were used as scriptural authorities by the abovenamed divisions of Šaivas were Śiva Rahasya, Rudrayāmala Tantra and other works showing that the said works were in existence at the time of Šaṅkarâchârya. Šivarahasya treats of Liṅgadhārana and other matters kindred to it. This also shows that Vîrašaiva Religion existed at the time of Šri Šaṅkarâchârya. It is known that the 63 *Purāthanas* were prior to Šri Šaṅkarāchārya. According to Chennabasavapurāṇa, a work of 14th Century A. D., some of these 63 *Purāthanas* were Vîrašaivas. They are:—

(1) Ahappageyaru (In Tamil—Iyarpagai Nāyanār).
(2) Chirutoneyandaru (In Tamil—Sirutonda Nāyanār).
(3) Kaliganānatharu (In Tamil—Gananatha Nāyanār).
(4) Murkhanaianaru (In Tamil – Murkha Nāyanār).
(5) Perumalugaru (In Tamil—Idangudi Nāyanār).
(6) Mārabhaktaru (In Tamil—Îlayangudi Māra Nāyanār).
(7) Chendakesigalu (In Tamil—Chendeswara Nāyanār).
(8) Siriyala Setti (In Tamil—Sirutonda Nāyanār).

This shows that the Virasaiva Religion existed at the time of the *Purāthanas*. According to Vrishabhendra Vijaya, in Kannada, an old work, some of the *Purāthanas* are described as giving alms to *Jaṅgamas*. A I have already shown above, the word Jaṅgama is applied to the Šaivas who carry the figure of Liṅga

on the head. This also shows the existence of the Vîrašaivas at the time of the *Purāthanas*. I hear that the word Jaṅgama is also used in one or two places in Peria Purāṇa. If it be so, it will add strength to my remark. Saint Tirumûlar who is one of the 63 *Purāthanas* treats of Shatsthala in his works. Shatsthala is a tenet of the Vîrašaivas. This also shows that the Vîrašaiva Religion existed at the time of the *Purāthanas*. Tāyumānavar Svāmigaḷ makes use of the worlds Guru, Liṅga and Jaṅgama in his works. But, as he is a recent personage, he will not be of avail to prove the antiquity of the Vîrašaiva Religion. On a consideration of all the circumstances mentioned above, I am somewhat forced to think that the birth-place of Vîrašaiva Religion is the Tamil country, that the members of the Vîrašaiva Religion first developed it in the Tamil Country. Be this as it may, what is it that makes some people think that the Liṅgadhāraṇa Religion is a recent religion and it was founded by Basavešvara of Kalyan, in spite of the existence of Vedas, Smritis, &c., which treat of Liṅgadhāraṇa. People seem to have been dazzled by the suddenness and brilliancy of Basavešvara's grand work of reform. They think that the system of Liṅgadhāraṇa is an innovation introduced by him. This is a great mistake. It may be that Basavešvara introduced many reforms into the existing Liṅgadhāraṇa religion, or he might have put into practice many things that existed in theory prior to him, such as regarding all men who were Šivabhaktas as equals, kindness to all living things &c. But it cannot be that he invented the wearing of Liṅga on the body. It exists from the early times. This mistaken idea about the time of the Vîrašaiva Religion is due to want of study of Vîrašaiva Literature as well as other works on the snbject. The present day English educated Vîrašaivas also have not taken trouble to translate Vîrašaiva works into English and many of them have not studied the works in original even. This is a great misfortune of the Vîrašaiva Religion. Much activity is going on among the Vîrašaivas of the Karnataca country. Vîrašaiva Conferences are held every year. Vîrašaiva Boarding

houses are established. Grand Funds for the promotion of the English education of the Vîrašaivas are started. But of what avail are all these ? Things are not done with right earnestness. The only substantial and good works that may be considered to have been done with real love for the religion are those executed by the late Varad Mallappa of Sholapur, the late Lingappa gayappa Sirsinge, the late Virasangappa of Mysore, the living Kumaraswami of Hunagal and the publication of the old Vîra-šaiva classic works by the living Mr. N. R. Karibasava Sastri of Mysore. The only useful work that the English educated Vīrašaiva can do for the religion is printing grand works such as Sreekara Bashya and other works and translating excellent books such as Siddhānta Sikāmani. To do this agreat amount of labour and self-sacrifice is necessary.

J. B.

NOTE.

[The expression Guru, Linga, Jangama is a technical one. They are the forms of God, worshipping which God shows his grace. Guru is one's Acharya, and Jangama are Sivabhaktas and they have to be worshipped as God Himself. These both form the Jangama or moveable Form. The Stavara or immoveable Form in the Sivalinga which has to be worshipped also as Siva Himself. This is the subject of the 12 sutra of Sivajñānabodham.

cf. தாவர சங்கமங்களென்றிடு முருவினின்று
மாபரன் பூசைகொண்டு மன்னுயிற் கருளைவைப்பன்.—ED].

NAMMĀLVĀR'S TIRUVIRUTTAM.

(*Continued from page 539 of No. 12, Vol. XII.*)

Verse 21, (*Sutiu'nan-mālai-kaḷ*).

Heading.—The Bridegroom—set to prove his strength of arm,
Bull taming-feat chivalrous doth perform.

Text.—While, in Heav'n, Angels, holding up wreaths pure
And fine—fit for Thy wearing, (2) had bathed Thee,
[After performing, duly, Worship's (1) Morn-Hymn Stage*]
And (3) were presenting incense good to Thee,
Thou, by th' pow'r of Thy magic will unique,
Cam'st here to take and taste the butter which
Cowherdesses, by churning, made and stored;
And, that Thou might 'st wed the val'rous cowherds' girl—
Whose frame 's fair as flow'r-creeper, didst
Dance 'mid the strong-bent-horns of th' high-protub'ranced bulls
(And prove true th' say'ng—"Beauty can miracles inspire"†)

Explanation.—To soothe our Seer, 'fore his mind's eye the Lord appeared
And seemed t' assure him in the manner following :—
" While all the hosts of Heav'n 's e'er worshipping Our Feet,
We 've, on the same earth *you* dwell on, incarnate come,
That we may like the same things that are liked by you,
And that, removing all bars, we may you enjoy !"
"Quite so, O Lord !" our Seer replies, and pondering
His Latest Incarnation, adds the follow'ng praise :—

1. Angels offer " wreaths pure and fine," their off'rings be'ng
"Quite *un*polluted by (1) worms, (2) hair and (3) thorns be'ng mixt ;—

---

* In Mantrāsana or "the Council-holding Seat."

† *Wit and Wisdom* of the Earl of Beaconsfield—Benjamin Disraeli, Longman, 1886, p. 4.

"(1) *I* agent am, (2) this is *my* act, (3) this *boon* I want,"
Angels ne'er say, free as they are from th' van'ties Three:—.
(1) Vain pride of agency, (2) vain sense of ownership,
(3) Vain seeking selfish boons, 'thout be'ng resigned to Thee!
(Gita, 18. 4.="Tyagohi...tri-vidhah," and see Bhāshya thereon.)

2. Angels stand—"*holding up* wreaths pure," till, at
Thy own good pleasure, Thou acceptest them.
Angels thus show their be'ng resigned to Thee

3. Angels bathe Thee with knowledge—ever ripe as love.

4. While Angels' Worship of Thee in Heav'n, as far as
The (2) bathing and (3) adorning stages * had advanced,
Worship's (4) food-off'ring stage, ‡ Thou, come on Earth, receivedst.

5. "While...Angels...were presenting incense," Thou "cam'st here"
"By th' pow'r of Thy...magic" as if hid in the smoke,
And didst perform feats and wed Thy Cowherdess-Queen!
Worship's (5) *last* on bed-off'ring stage§ too here thus hadst!

6. Thus, half in Heav'n, and half on Earth, Thou worshipped wast!
The food—Earth gave Thee, 's "butter" called, because,
'Tween (1) milk and (3) ghee, 'tis (2) intermediate,
And typifies (2) the pondering of Thee
By souls—Know'ng their relationship with Thee
(1) From sinners parted, (3) not arrived in Heav'n. (Cp. the Vedic description of the Dikshita's condition: (1) "Prachyuto vā asmāl lokād, (3) 'a-gato deva lokam." – Taitt. Samhita, Kānda 6, Prapāthaka 1, Anu 1, opening of Panchāsat 1.)

7. The bulls' horns, dancing 'midst which Thou tamedst them,
Are strayers' sins—done in lust-stirring frames.

---

* = Snānāsanālankārāsane.

‡ = Bhojyāsanam.

§ Sayyāsanam.

8. In all the earth, the guileless cowherdess Thou didst
Choose for Thy Queen, that souls, their own works may distrust
And learn to trust Thee as their Sole Salvation Means,
[*Vide* Psalm 3, *v.* 28. = "Karavai-kaḷ-pin..." = Pope's lines "O...teach vain wits a science little known, To admire superior sense and doubt their own." – *Essay on Criticism*
= "Thou hast hid these things from the wise...
And hast revealed them unto babes." (Christ' speech See Matt. 11. 25.)

Verse 22, (Komb'-âr-thaḻai).

Heading. – The Bridegroom's taunted by the Bride's Girl-friend
[Souls—for conversion fit, though *now* vain, are th' "Bridegroom
Here (See the next Verse' Explanation, Para One).
That is, souls whom our Seer felt sure he could convert,
He doth, with pow'er of forecaste, "Bridegroom" designate
Para-kāla's spouse—Kumud'-valli,
Him did thus (1) mark out, then (2) convert,
And, in all glory, (3) wed at last!
Thus Clive's friends, "Captain" called him ere he Captain grew. Grammarians Sam-skrit, thus "Grammarian" name –
(1) Him who in Grammar's novice, as him who 's adept.
Vide Pāṇini's Ashta-dyayi, 4. 2. 59. = (1) "Tad adhite, (2) tad veda."]

Text.—All that this gentleman hath in his hand
Is the leaf of a plant. Of th' small bow-string's
Sound, we hear nought (—for he doesn't bear a bow).
have none
Hunting 's what he *doth boast of* as his forte.
An el'phant—by an arrow pierced, is what
He makes the subject of enquiry here.
His acts and words are such, that th' like thereof
Have ne'er been known in th' world of th' lurking Lord

Who on the Kerub rides, and which,
With one another, don't consist!
Is it to answer questions strange
That we 've been placed in this great field?

Explanation.—1. Souls with conceit of learning, coming to our Seer
tell their state, our Seer's Friends them rebuke, saying,—
boast
"Your conduct, mutually inconsistent is!"

2. What he "hath in his hand is the leaf of a plant."
"Sense-objects—leaf like spread,"* haven't still, dropped from his hands.

3. "Of th' small bow-string's sound, we hear nought."—Not e'en the *sound*
Of th' bow-like Pra-nav, th' Holy Monosyllable
Pronounced to dart souls, arrow-like, t' wards God their Aim
From this man comes; hence, it seems, he its sense doesn't grasp

4. "Hunting 's what he doth boast..." In straying's wilderness
He boasts he 's bent on hunting th' beasts—Desire and Hate
Av'rice and Stupefaction, and the like of these.

5. "An el'phant—by an arrow pierced" he now pursues
Sense-organs are the elephant,
Which, though by subtle knowledge pierced
And sought to be brought 'neath control,
Have run into sense objects' wilds,
And this man 's still pursuing them!
["What I should do I know, yet do I won't;
What I should shun I know, yet shun I won't!"
Thus one confesses in th' Mahā-bhārat. (="Jānāmi dharmam" &c).
Thus speaks our Seer himself in his (=third work! See Psalm 20, v. 3.=Ivai-y-anṛ'-ē nal-l-a".)]
"I'd rather teach twenty the way to live, than be

---

* "Vishaya pravalah" Gitā 15. 2.

One of the twenty to follow mine own teaching."

6. The phrase—"this gentleman", hints he 's
A "fool...wise in his own conceit." (—Prov., 26, 5.)

7. Who on the Kerub rides", shows that—
(1) Ved-Doctrine and (2) Ved-Discipline
Are op'rative as be'ng God's will. (="Sruti-Smriti Mamaivajma" &c.)

8. By "th' Lurking Lord" is meant that He souls guards, unseen. (="Yam ātmā na veda. Bri. Up. 5, 7, 22 or 3, 7, 22 per jacob's concordance and according to the Mādhandina Recension.)

9. "In the world" or earth "of th'...Lord".—The "Earth" as be'ng hard shows—
The Lord's will 's indefeas'ble, uncontrollable.

10. "That we've been placed in this great field" means that our Seer's
Sphere 's marked off by th' Lord as His chosen—weeded—ground
For be'ng enjoyed by Him as much as Heav'n itself,
Our Seer and His Friends be'ng guardians made thereof.
["I thank Thee, Father!" Christ doth say,
Thou hast hid these things from the wise...
And hast revealed them unto babes."—Matt. 21, 25; Luke, 10, 21.]

Verse 23. (*Punam o puna-tt'-ayal e.*)

Heading.—Seeing the Bride and her Friends while they watch their field,
The Bridegroom Humbly—feelingly—reveals states His love,
[(1) Tiru-kovai, (2) Vānan-kovai, (3) Tanikai-p-Purāṇam,
Each of the book—a like expression doth contain.]
Say'ng—"you appropriate my heart and watch o'er it
Excluding others all, as in th' case of your field!"

Text.—Womanhood's Types! say—Is't (1) the *field*,
(2) or else the *heart* of me—sinful—

Who, by the field, have chanced to pass
That forms the object of your watch?
Transcending as ye do the host of Angels who
Dwell in the Heav'n of Krishna—the All present Lord
Whose eye transcends the host of fine-hued lot'uses red,
Are *these* (heart robbing feats and th' like,) your proper
marks?

Explanation.—1. "Wise" men (see v. 22, Explanation paras I and VI)—whom counsel, as in th' last verses, converts made,
As follows speak in admiration of our seer.

2. "Say—Is't (1) the field...?"—Is't *that* part of this world which you
Have taught to trust God as the Sole Salvation-Means
(—That 's, souls—whose characters you've "moulded" and "matures")? [See "Vintage Gleanings" gathered from the Rev. J. H. Evans 's sermons, 2nd Edn., 1850, p. vii]

3. "(2) Or else" is it th' heart of ourselves—who take the Path
Of Works which, in the neighbourhood of your sphere, lies?

4. "Of me—sinful."—"*Sin*" here, 's the pain cause or th' strong love
Whence e'en the *thought* of parting is impossible.

5. "Womanhood's Types!"—Ye who obedience' Models are,
And souls' Best Guides in their Essential Virtue o'er!
Tell me, please, *what* 'tis that 's controllable by you!
High'r as ye are than e'en th' Angels—whose lordly host
To join, all Saints aspire, and who dwell th' Highest Heav'n
Of Krishṇa—who, doth, by His very lotus-eye,
His (1) lordship, (2) love and (3) pleasantry unique, e'er show,
You watch *here*, that e'en strayed souls may to th' Path be brought!

[Thus, praise, in th' form of blame, to our Seer is conveyed!
"Ganga!—thou Heavenly Stream! hast thou the least good sense?
Lo! thou dost even *sinners* elevate to Heav'n!"—Jayadeva's Chandra-loka, under the figure of speech entitled "Vyaja-Stuti" or "Blame-shaped Praise" and its converse.)—"Kas Svar-dhuni!" &c. See Sir Raja Rathakanta-Deva Bahadur's Sabda-kalpa druma 2nd edition Calcutta, under "Alankara", figure No. 101.]

Verse 24, (Iyalv'ā-y-in-a.)

Heading.—Noting the parted Bride's great pain,
The Mother of the Bride laments

Text.—With pain—caused by love natural and hid,
My girl of bracelets fine, casts tearful eyes
Whereof each is wide as the human palm,
And, as do fishes in tanks—water-filled,
'Mid tear-floods moves in all directions here
(From unrest—by her loved-one's absence caused)!
She longs to have the honeyed—new-plucked—Tul'si-flower
Of Him—who on the Kerub rides, and erst,
With Mount Go-vardhan, saved cows' herds from rain!
I know not, ah! *what* this girl will befall
(O'er and above th' confusion of her eyes and heart)!

Explanation—1. The ground of Saints' thus praising our Seer, be'ng his love
Unique for God, and yet, denied enjoyment due,
As he grief-shattered was, Friends, sympathising, cry:—
2. "(1) His charming *outward organs*—moved by
Love natural (to th' feeler only known)*,
In pain-caused tear-floods wander to and fro
So as to make Saints even long to hold
And scan them in the hollow of their hand;

* *Vide* the Brahma Sutras, 3. 4. 49 = "An-avish-keervan," &c. = "Without parade of love," &c.

"(2) His *inward organ* 's eager for enjoy'ng
Th' sweet wreath of Him who can save souls distressed,
Performing, unto this end, th' greatest feats,
And moving so fast as t' inspire the psalm
'The speed wherewith the Lord began to ride
To the lake where the el'phant cried to Him,
As one 'mong many a blest trait, we adore!' (=Bhagavatas tvarāyai namaḥ! Sage Bhattārya's Hymn to the Lord as manifest in Sri-rangam, Centum II, v. 57.)
"(3) From such a Seer's hand is't poss'ble the status of
The soul resigned, the basis of our hope, should slip?"

Verse 25. (Em-gol-vaḷai muthal a.)

Heading.—The Bride, desiring th' Bridegroom's wreath,
Out of impatience makes complaint.

Text.—The Tul'si, worn with zeal* by Krishna—Lord
Of (1) th' lord of th' pow'rful gods, and (2) Angels all,
And (3) us—inhab'tants of this lower sphere;
(Intoxicated by th' favour He shows,)
Doth loose my bracelets fine and spoil His rule—
Famed for be'ng guardian alike of Earth and Heav'n!
What other harm won't it work, after this, on earth
In ev'ry part thereof, be't (1) wood, (2) hill, (3) field, or (4) beach?

Explanation.—Our Seer—who such impression made on all his Friends,
Cries, in the rage of love—"Th' Lord's sweetness, mischief works!
We 're entities—dependent on the Lord. The best
Jewel in our 's to live, say'ng—'Lord! Thy will be done.' Cp. Matt., 6, 10; Luke, 11, 2; and Matt., 26, 42.)
Sent Resignation Status in me is be'ng spoiled
By reason of the Tul'si-wreath's inflaming me
With such intense love as makes me brook no delay,

* *Vide* Psalm 24 1. ix 7.

Not knowing—'they serve Him best, who best bear His mild yoke,' (Milton's Sonnet on His Blindness.)
Protecting o'er as it does *Heav'n* as well as Earth!
This wreath, exciting treason thus, His rule would spoil
[For, treason is the sum of every offence]!
(1) Primordial Matter, (2) unfreed Souls, (3) their Bodies Gross,
(4) Time (—whence the Law of Periodicity is known*),
All these Four Parts of This Lower Sphere, confounded seem!"

(*To be continued.*)

A. G.

மகாமகோபாத்யாய, டாக்டர்
உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர் நூல் நிலைய
அடையாறு, சென்னை-20

---

* *Vide* Brande's Scientific Dictionary, which pronounces this Law to be one of the Greatest Discoveries of Modern Science. One form of this Law is the Law of Heredity, which Mr. Skrine (in his biography of Dr. S. Chunder Mookerji) gives equally high praise.

THE "ĀGAMIC BUREAU" NOTES.

The system of the Vedanta by Dr. Paul Deussen Translated into English by Charles Johnston B.C.S., The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1912.

This invaluable work of Dr. Deussen was published long long ago in German, and before his translation of the Sankara Bashya itself, and Mr. Charles Johnston who is familiar to Madras readers by his learned contributions to the "Madras Mail' has translated this book into English, thus affording an opportunity for non-Germans to get an insight into the rich researches of the German Vedantist. And we remember requesting a friend of ours to translate for us a few of the chapters at least of the learned work. So far as the translator's task is concerned, we are glad to acknowledge that it is done in the best English style, and the translator has also brought out the meaning of the author clearly.

With regard to the subject matter of the book, it is a summary of the Bashya of Sri Sankaracharya on the Brahma Sutras arranged under different heads in five parts, (1) Theology or the doctrine of Brahman, (2) Cosmology or the doctrine of the Soul, (4) Samsara or the doctrine of the Transmigration of the Soul (5) Moksha or the teaching of the Liberation, comprising nearly 34 chapters, besides an introduction of 6 chapters containing literary notes &c., which contain the Doctor's own researches into the field of the Vedanta. There is also an appendix containing a short survey of the Vedanta System, indexes, glossary, &c. The Vedanta expounded here strictly follows the interpretation of Sankara, as the author himself has clearly expressed and he did not propose to go into the question whether Sankara's interpretation was borne out by the text of the Sūtras themselves; and which as we now know has been done by Dr. Thibaut in the introduction to his translation of Sankara Bashya into English and was on the main question

concurred in by the profound scholar Max Muller. So that any criticism we have to offer on the subject matter will have to deal with Sankara's views on Vedanta, and this we do not propose to do at present. We would however note that the learned Doctor is not himself oblivious to the defects of the system, which he notes *ēnpassant*, and his proud boast, that the true explanation was alone offered by Kant. As we noted long ago, in our study of this system, the entire mischief, and a fruitful source of error and fallacy consist in shifting the ground as it suits their purpose from Pāramārthika to Vyavahāra and from Vyavahāra to Pāramārthika. "The extension of the world and and the plurality of wandering souls, this hybrid which is neither Being nor non-Being (tattva anyatvābhyām anirvacaniyam) and comparable to a hallucination or a dream is produced by ignorance by virtue of the upadhis, the limitations, (literally the ascription, with the secondary idea of the unpermitted) by means of which, we 'ascribe' to Brahman what does not naturally belong to him, and though as we shall show in detail, he becomes (1) a personal God, (2) the world, (3) the individual soul. All this depends on the *Upadhis*, and *Upadhis* on *Avidya*. Avidya is alone the cause of the origin of the *Upadhis*, (they are *avidyā Krita*, *avidyā-nimitta*, *avidyā-pratya pasthapita*) and is the cause of their persistence, so far as the essence of Avidyā is the non-descrimination of Brahman from the upadhis (*upadhi-aviveka*). Brahman himself is not in the least affected or changed by the upadhis. just as little in fact as the crystal by the red colour with which it is painted. It is in this sense a contact of the upadhis (upadhi-samparka), and a contamination by them is spoken of. Brahman is merged in the upadhis (upadhi-antarbhava) and thereby his nature is hidden (Svarūpa Tirobhāvā) and his natural omniscience (in his external form as soul) suffers a limitation (the knowledge of the soul is *upadhi parichchinna*)" (pp. 304 and 305).

There was Brahman alone, one without a second. Somehow Avidya and its products (upadhis) intervened, and the Brahman became, the Personal God, souls, and the world, but

the upadhis and Avidya, not covering Brahman, covers Its Products. But how did the one become three without the one being covered by Avidya? This is a juggle, and our learned Doctor himself sees this absurdity and says, (p. 302) 'In reality (Paramārthatas) there is nothing else besides Brahman alone. If we imagine we perceive a transformation (Vihāra) of Him into the world, a division (*bheda*) of Him into a plurality of individual souls, this depends on *Avidyā*. But how does this happen? How do we manage to deceive ourselves into seeing a transformation and a plurality, where in reality Brahma alone is? *On this question our authors give no information*".

The italics are ours, and the sentence is pregnant with the impotency of the system to explain the origination of the world &c. unless Avidya itself should surely cover and constrain Brahman.

We take leave to cite even another passage where this absurdity is pointed out (p. 281) " Brahman is omniscient and omnipotent everlasting, pure, wise, free. Because he is free, he can do what he wills; for him there is neither command nor prohibition, and therefore neither good nor evil. The individual soul, on the contrary is affected by good and evil, and of it, we do not at all maintain that it is the creator of the world—without committing himself to the question, *unavoidable from this standpoint, 'whence then springs the individuvl soul with its good and evil?'* our author at once passes on to the metaphysical question 'But how is this? Are not God and the soul the same according to the words *tattvamasi*?" "When by the teaching of non-separatenesss through sentences like *tattvamasi*, the consciousness is awakened, then the wanderings of the soul and the creative function of Brahman cease" &c. The remedy given here is all right but so long as the cause of the separation is not explained, the remedy will be of no use; and the disease will again sprout up. We quote another sentence before we close this review. (p. 278).

"That empirical Theism (for which the world is real and different from God) is untenable appears nowhere so clearly as

in the region of morals. For however the matter be turned, in a real creation, which is seriously taken, the responsibility for evil, for the sin of the world finally falls on God." So the only go for the Vedantists to avoid this catastrophe is to deny the reality of the world and the souls and the existence of evil &c. But even then, the final question, 'How did this illusion arise, and in whom' still remains, and without an explanation, this illusion itself will be visited on the devoted Head of the Brahman, Free and wise and pure. There are others like Professor K. Sundararaman who do not agree with the exposition of the learned Doctor's, about the unreality of the world &c. but we may point out that in the book before us each statement is supported by quoting chapter and verse from Sankara and in most instances with long quotations from the Bashya itself. The learned Doctor may or may not be right in his identifying Sankara's system with that of Kant and of claiming greater credit for the German system, but so far as the exposition of Sankara's system is concerned, it is mostly accurate. And the reader of this volume would certainly get an easy and more comprehensive view of the system than by reading any translation of the Bashya itself.

Only one thing more. Regarding the illustration quoted from p. 302, that of crystal and colours, the readers attention may be usefully called to the explanation of the Siddhanta School of this very simile. The mischief in the use of this illustration consists in taking the crystal to stand for God. The crystal however pure in itself has the demerit of being covered fully by the colours painted on it, and the crystal vanishes altogether and the colours alone are seen. Who painted these colours on the crystal. Did the crystal itself seek the imposition? Did Brahman cover himself with *avidyā*? If he did once, could he not do it once more? But if he could be covered by darkness, could he still be called Brahman? On the other hand, read the siddhānti's explanation. The crystal is not God but the soul. The soul though pure in itself has the demerit of becoming one with whatever It is assciated with (அது அது

ஆதல்) like the crystal, and its own individuality disappears, and by its identity with the body and the world, first caused by Avidya, all the evil ensues. And its release consists when it will perceive that it is not the body and will turn its back on it and seek its rest in God. This bhanda and moksha of the crystal or soul is not possible except in the Presence of the Sun, Siva-sat, as in darkness, no one could distinguish the crystal or the colours, Pasa or Upadhis, and the Sun is God. The crystal does not receive the Light of God on account of the covering by the colours. The colours could not in any way be said to affect the Sun. So the ascription of avidya to Brahman is avoided and the portulate of an unreal world, unreal good and evil and unreal ignorance is all avoided, and a sane explanation of the whole-world's phenomena is given. Om Tat Sat.

***

A controversy.

A little heated controversy has been going on between the Vice-President and Secretary of the Saiva Siddhānta Sabha Tuticorin, for some time. From what we see from their pamphlets, the matter had been talked over between them, before it saw the light in print. As both parties have appealed to us for our opinion, we venture to give it, though we do not presume to possess the great erudition which these learned pundits possess. In the first place, we must take leave to observe that the parties would have done better to have treated one another with greater respect. None are too learned that he might not learn some thing fresh from a person comparatively less learned. We should not even deny to our very opponents learning and honesty. Differences arise from varying points of view, and the different planes they dwell in; and it may be both may be wrong and both may be right. Saiva Siddhantis always pride themselves on holding to the postulate of Saint Aruḷ Nandi Sivachariar that the true religion ought not to possess the fault of calling this right and that wrong but should try to see the means of justly reconciling conflicting views. Our friends, as ardent Saiva Siddhantis and belonging to the same sabha

should bear with each other in kindliness and love. And then alone the real truth will flash out. We would again say that we are not for discouraging controversies. Healthy controversies and discussions always stimulate thought and greater mental improvement. It is our experience that whenever we discussed a point with a friend, we found a new thought always strike us as in a flash, which would not have arisen but for the particular pressure of the moment. But the one condition requisite is that we ought not intrude too much of our own self.

The present controversy has arisen out of certain views expressed by Pandit P. M. Muttiah Pillai Avergal in his learned work '*Dasakarya viḷakkam*'. We welcomed the work as it appeared as it was the first connected exposition of the subject in prose; and we had listened to his oral discourses on the same subject also with great pleasure. But the principal points at issue seem to be two only, which are not material to the subject of *Dasakāryam*; and they relate to the questions whether all souls will attain to final release at some time or other altogether, and whether God's Form is formed out of Suddha Māyā. Mr. Muttiah Pillai holds on a text from Siddhiar that all the souls will not attain moksha even though ages might pass and that God's form is out of Suddha māyā. Mr. Subramania Pillai in his pamphlet controverts these propositions. It is a cardinal doctrine of Saivism that each soul will in the end attain salvation, though the time depends on each one's own development, and there is absolutely no return for such freed souls. This is not denied by either party. What is asserted by Mr. Muttiah Pillai is that there will be souls for ever and ever other than those who had attained release; and he bases it on a text in Siddhiar (xi. 6) which by the way establishes our previous proposition. The whole verse is as follows.

"Though the husk and bran is associated with the rice without beginning (anādi), tell me how they stand after separation from the rice. Hear! They are not attached to the rice perfectly polished of all dirt. There will be no attachment as no new paddy seed will rise from the polished rice. The

separation is absolute. Similarly also in the final relase in union with the good Siva, āṅava, maya and karma will surely leave the soul. *As they will be attached to bound souls, we may say they are not destroyed.*" As Mr. Muttiah Pillai observes the question is not a new one, and St. Umapathi Sivachariar's answer in his Tiruvarutpayan is "The number of those who have attained to Release and those who are yet to attain it, is in proportion to the days that are past and the days that are yet to pass. And Sri la Sri Somasundara Nayagar observed that when time is destroyed, then will be destroyed the sins of all the souls. And to the question when Time will cease, he referred the questioner to his guru, which really means that this is not a matter to be considered by us. In regard to the verse from Siddhiar, the verse was chiefly intended to establish the annihilation of all Pasa though it was called *anādi*, so far as regards each individual soul, and it is only by way of explaining the experession further it is incidently observed that in as much as there are other bound souls, it may still be said to be not destroyed. But there is nowhere stated that there will be no time when all the existing souls will not have obtained final release; and of course, this will be possible when Time itself is annihilated. This may or may not be possible, but it is not a matter on which we need vex ourselves. As far as we could see before us, there seems to be no near future when such a consummation seems possible, and we would request our friends to cease to wrangle about it.

As regards the other question, we think Mr. Muttiah is wrong in his interpretation of verse 41 of Sutra I. The verse is as follows

மாயைதான் மலத்தைப்பற்றி வருவதோர் வடிவமாகும்
மாயவாணவ மகன்றவறிவொடு தொழிலையார்க்கும்
நகயகனெல்லா ஞானத்தொழிமுதல் நண்ணலாலே
காயமோ மாயையன்று காண்பது சத்திதன்னால்.

"The bodies formed of maya are obtained by the souls in consequence of their being covered by *ānava mala*. The Supreme one is free from maya and *ānava mala*, and is pure absolute

intelligence, and imparts both knowledge and power to souls, His body cannot be formed out of maya but is formed of His Sakti." Mr. Muttiah Pillai says that maya here means asuddha maya and sakti means suddha maya, and he further goes on to say that this body formed of suddha maya is indispensable to God to perform the five functions. No doubt maya is also called his sakti and Mr. Muttiah Pillai admits, even suddha maya is only God's Parigraha Sakti and not his Chit-Sakti; and we are quite sure he won't confuse the Chit-sakti called Uma &c. and which is above all the 36 Tattvas formed out of Suddha maya, and Suddha maya itself, with the latter. And he would admit it is this Chit-sakti of the Lord which is called Ichcha, Jñana, and Kriya, and Arūl Saktis, (vide invocation in Siddhiar). This sakti is called Abhinna and Samavaya Sakti as distinguished from maya which is called Bhinna Sakti, and the various commentators on verse 41. quoted above clearly make out that the sakti referred to in the verse is this Samavaya and Abhinna Chit Sakti. Sivagra Yogi interprets it as chit sakti, Jñānapragasar as Siva's Samaveda (Samavāya) Sakti, Sivajñānayogi as Sakti which shines forth as Vyapaka Jñāna, and Niramba Vaḷagiar as Arūl Sakti. And Mr. Muttiah Pillai's question whether the author himself would not have used the words chit-sakti if he meant so is pointless. This is further made clear by verse 55 in which Rūpa, Arūpa and Rūpārūpa forms are called God's Karuṇa Form or Arūl forms. And in verse 45, it is shown how He assumes any Form He likes out of His Grace (Arūl) and the various parts of His Form are said to be all grace in V. 47, with which is to be compared the text from taitriya up. ii. 5. (His Head is surely love; Joy His right wing; delight His left; Bliss is His self. Brahman wherein He rests.) And it is further shown in V. 46, that the reason for his assuming these different forms is the salvation of mankind, by revealing the Vedas, by imparting instruction in the form of the guru to gods, men &c. And in other verses (V. 54) it is clearly shown that it is Siva with His Chit-Sakti that carries all the Panchakrityas &c. and not any other Gods. Mr. Muttiah Pillai however refers to verse I-66 in which Suddha Maya Tatvas are also called Siva's Svatantra forms. Not only

this, but the six aḍhvas are also called His bodies, (V. 56) and in verse 60, the gods Vishnu and Brahma are also His forms, and the nine forms Sivam Sakti to Vishnu and Brahma are also called Siva Himself. The reason given in v. 56 will apply to all these cases, and it is because God is eternal and omnipresent and inseparable for all these bodies, and he actuates both chit (souls) and achit (maya), that the Vedas call him *adhva* mūrti; and the five Suddha Tatvas are comprised under the six *adhvas*. The whole *chetana* and *achetana* Prapanchá constitute His Body, and in it He dwells and works. But His glory and power is more and more manifest as these bodies are purer and purer and more subtle; and the reason also why the bodies formed of the Suddha maya Tatvas are called His svatantra is because these bodies are the purest and most translucent, that the Light of the Lord, God's Parasakti shines in Its purest ray serene, and the bodies are altogether merged in the Pure Light; and this is exactly the reason given in v. 67. And it seems not to be well known that in these 5 Suddha Tatvas dwell some of the *Navam Tharu Betham*, Nādamūrti &c., who are souls of the order of Vijñanakalars and these also are not distinguished from the Supreme Siva for the same reasom. Sivajñana Yogi says that even Rudra of the Trinity other than the guṇi Rudra is a Pralayakalar, with body in Asuddha Maya and yet He gets the same names and forms as the Supreme Siva, because on account of his purer body, Supreme Siva shines in him also and shows grace in that Form. And it will be unnecessary to refer to v. 62, where the Form of sakti is said to be தடையிலாஞானம், Pure Intelliggence. Of course, there are others who identify the Lord's Chit sakti itself with *suddha māyā or kudilai*, or *kundalini* and we are quite sure that Mr. Muthiah Pillai does not belong to this school. As we have written this only in the interest of Truth and at Mr. Muthia Pilldi's invitation, we hope he would not raise any further controversy on the subject, but would continue to labour for the sake of Siddhānta, as he is now wholeheartedly doing.